

Masonic government on this continent, and every infringement of the same should be crushed out upon all occasions and at all hazards. It is useless to uphold the dogma of unanimity in the formation of Grand Lodges. If we did, Scotland at the present time would be without a sovereign authority, so far as Symbolic Masonry is concerned, since Melrose Abbey Lodge, after an existence of over one hundred and fifty years, declines to enrol herself under the banner of the Grand Lodge of Scotland; it was only the other day that the Irish Lodge at L'Orignal, Ontario, surrendered her charter, and the Grand Lodge of Quebec, after a practical and successful existence of over thirteen years, finds the three English lodges in Montreal as firm in their allegiance to the mother Grand Lodge of England as they were in 1869. Is it not, with these instances before us, absurd to argue, as do the *Voice* and *Keystone*, that no Grand Lodge should be recognized as a sovereign Grand Body till all the lodges within its jurisdiction unite with it?

The evils of concurrent jurisdiction are too great to be tolerated, and it should be held as an indisputable rule that the moment a Grand Lodge is organized by a majority of lodges in unoccupied Masonic territory (*i. e.*, where there is no Grand Lodge) the minority of lodges must either fall into line or have their charters recalled or cancelled. In granting a charter to a lodge in unoccupied Masonic territory, let it be distinctly understood that its powers cease the moment a Grand Lodge is formed for such territory. This is the correct and only rule. Unanimity is excellent in theory, but

totally inadmissible in practice. It would leave it in the power of any fourth-rate lodge to retard Masonry for years in the jurisdiction in which it was located. In fact, we cannot conceive a greater calamity to the Craft than placing it within the power of a single lodge to obstruct *ad infinitum* the prosperity of Masonry in any given jurisdiction. It is investing with an absolute power an almost irresponsible party, and consequently would necessarily prove injurious to the interests of the Craft in general.

We are willing to admit that unanimity, when it can be obtained, is most desirable; but it is far from necessary. Look at the history of the formation of Grand Lodges from the earliest date, and we will find that in the vast majority of cases unanimity was an impossibility. The plan we suggest, of only granting warrants in unoccupied territory with power to work until a Grand Lodge may be organized there, would terminate these unseemly disputes; but so long as such lodges are permitted to exercise their powers and continue to work, so long will we find dissension with all its concomitant evils.

Would it not be ridiculous for the Supreme Masonic Bodies of the world to declare that the Grand Lodge of Scotland was an inchoate or fractional Grand Body, and not a sovereign organization, because Melrose Abbey Lodge continues to work on its "time immemorial" rights? And would it not be equally absurd to declare the Grand Lodge of Quebec a body without sovereign rights or supreme privileges because, forsooth, the Lodges of St. Paul, St. George and St. Tho-